## QUERIES Relating to the Garbling BILL.

Query I. If the Bill brought in be not much different from the Resolutions of the Honourable House of Commons, the said Resolution being only, that a Bill should be brought in to Regulate the Garbling of such Goods as were for Exportation; and this Bill leaves out many of the Goods enumerated in that Act, and Alters and Lessens the

Prices of those that remain therein?

II. Whether as this Bill is now framed, instead of Regulating Abuses as pretended, it doth not lay a Foundation to encourage many more, and greater Abuses, which the former Law effectually prevented, by laying a Penalty and Forseiture of the Goods upon the Importer, that were sold or used contrary to the direction of that Act; which Forseitures and Penalties by this Bill are wholly lest out?

III. Are not the Alterations now made in the Statute I Jacobi, the same in Effect, as it that wholsome Law were wholly repealed, and all the Goods by this Bill that are Liable to be Garbled, being to be consumed in London, and not otherwise, altho' by the former Acts and Customs it was All Goods sold in London, whether Consumed there or in other parts of this Kingdom?

IV. Is the Hire of Labouring Servants, and others imployed to do the Garbling Work, become cheaper now than it was Two hundred Years ago, when those Rates were first established and so continued to this Day, and what reafon can be given for Lessening the Ancient Fees and Duties (Turmerick always paid 16 d. per Cent. Weight for Garbling the same, but now is made 6 d. only, and Ginger always 12 d. is now made 6 d. and Long Pepper always 16 d. now 6 d. Bay Berries 8 d. now 4 d. &c.) If no Reason; Why are the Prices Lessened? And why are many of the Spices and Drugs expressly named in the Act of Parliament, which require Garbling, and are daily used in Meats, Drinks and Physicks more than any lest out of this Bill, which have always been Garbled time out of mind, and other less useful put in?

V. Is it not manifest that those Alterations are contrived on purpose to discourage the Publick Officer from the due Execution of his Duty, and disable him to pay his Rent of 300 l. per Ann. to the City, and 76 l. Taxes to the KING, and keep such Number of fit Servants to perform that Work

as now is, and hitherto he hath done?

VI. Who is it that pursues this Bill, and promotes those Rates to be set, and Excludes those other Spices and Drugs, &c. from Garbling; and lessens the Ancient Duties constantly paid to the City? Are they not such only who deal in those Commodities, and therefore endeavour to Excuse the Du-

ty for their own Private Interest?

VII. Are not the pursuers of this Bill Freemen of the City, and on their Admission do not they undertake to preserve the Rights and Customs of the City; and if it were not for their own Private Ends, would they Act contrary to their Duties in this case against the Antient Rights of the City, by promoting this Bill by which they will be at liberty to practise what they please, without any Restraint or Penalty from the Law, and the Publick lose many Advantages that arise from the due Execution of this Office, which the City and Kingdom have enjoyed for these 400 Years past to this time, and the present Officer deprived of his Freehold Estate, which he Purchased under an Act of Parliament.

QUERIES

Relating to the

Garbling Bill.



• On Distance seasons in NATION (in the property of